
This image shows a blank, aged, cream-colored page, likely an endpaper or flyleaf of a book. The paper has a slightly textured appearance with some minor discoloration and small dark spots, possibly due to age or handling. A horizontal crease is visible near the bottom edge of the page.

1870

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI,

Tuesday Morning, August 18, 1840.

REVIEW OF MR. RANKIN'S LETTER, Or Objections to the Support of a Pro-Slavery Ticket.

Having at last made room for ourselves, we shall proceed to examine the letter of the Rev. John Rankin, published in the Philanthropist of August 4th.

Mr. Rankin is distinguished for the inflexibility of his moral character, and his devotion to the anti-slavery cause. His mind operates generally with great steadiness and much caution, and his views on most subjects are clear. What he has written on the question of political action, we must receive as the last results of a careful examination controlled by honesty of purpose. His letter contains perhaps the pith of all the reasons that have been urged in behalf of the support of a *slavery-ticket*. Let us then with all deliberation and respect consider his argument.

A Wrong Position.

The first of his positions to be noticed is, that, although the anti-slavery cause is of more importance than any now agitated, "it is not the only one that claims attention." Hence, "if two candidates are before the people, and neither of them be an abolitionist," he "will vote for the one that" he "believes upon the whole will do most for the country." We use now his own language, but this does not clearly exhibit his ground. He concedes that Harrison and the leaders of the whig party have committed themselves to the Slave-Power. Still, he will support them, for the reason just mentioned. His real position then, a position which he holds in common with the rest of Harrison abolitionists, is this.—If all the candidates of both parties are openly hostile to abolition, and formally pledged to the support of slavery, he will nevertheless vote for those who, "he believes upon the whole, will do most for the country."

We deem the position wrong for the following reasons.

1. It Involves a Contradiction.

All true abolitionists, with Mr. Rankin believe, that the anti-slavery question is more important than any now agitated in politics. They are therefore bound in consistency and sound policy, to make it the test question. So long as they refrain from doing this, they say in effect that it is not of paramount importance, and pursue the very course calculated to confirm the public mind in this error. If it be indeed of more importance than any other political question, common sense dictates that those who so regard it, should vote for no one who is not sound in his opinions respecting it; for until they adopt this course, they will never induce others to act aright. But, Mr. Rankin's position is a virtual postponement of this most important question, for the sake of what he believes upon the whole is the best for the country. Just as if any good of importance could be expected from a government, essentially vitiated in its policy, and acting in direct opposition to the fundamental principles of civil polity. Mr. Rankin will admit, that the great disturbing force in our government is, the Slave-Power; that the great fountain of political, and a principal source of moral, corruption in this nation, is Slavery. So long as this shall continue and that shall rule, the evil that may be done by government independently of their influence, and the good to be expected from an administration under their control, will be comparatively insignificant,—so insignificant as to render a choice between candidates bound by their power, a matter of little moment. Besides, the simple fact, of competitors for office in a republic—founded on the principle of equality of rights—being pledged to slavery, a system entrenched on the ruins of all rights, creates a presumption against their moral and political integrity, which should suffice to disqualify them in the estimation of real republicans for any office whatsoever. Notwithstanding all this, Mr. Rankin, for the sake of a good, insignificant in itself, and scarcely to be expected from the action of officers chosen on account of their defection from correct principle, would postpone what he believes is the most important of political questions, and, in derogation of its claims, sustain a slavery ticket!

2. White Maintained, Slavery Cannot Be Abolished.

2. Were all abolitionists agreed in this position, so long as they should maintain it, slavery could not, by peaceful means, be abolished. Slaveholders with one voice declare to the politician that, if none of the candidates claiming their suffrages be pro-slavery, they will vote for none. Abolitionists, on the contrary, are at pains to assure him in the language of Mr. Rankin, that, if none of the candidates be an abolitionist, they will vote for that slaveholding or anti-abolition man, who, they "believe on the whole will do most for the country." Now, as the mere politician studies chiefly his own interest, he of course will always make it his business to gratify the slaveholder. Were the whole north thus abolitionized, a batch of southern aristocrats would still give us our presidents, aye, and our legislators too, until abolitionists should abandon this ground of Mr. Rankin, and resolve to vote for none but freemen. Let us press this consideration on the reader. The slaveholder and the abolitionist are the antagonists in this great struggle. The former plants his foot on a rock, and declares, "I will never vote for an abolitionist." The latter ventures to say that he would prefer greatly not to vote for a slaveholder, but he will do it, if he can find none better. The slaveholder clearly makes slavery the test question—the paramount consideration. If so, what does the abolitionist? Make abolition paramount? No—he succumbs to the slaveholder, and votes for his candidate, thus conceding by his vote, in fact, that slavery is the major consideration.

Again we ask the question we so often have asked; how long will it take to abolish slavery by such policy? a policy, which rallies the abolitionist under the banner of slavery, and makes every vote he casts count one for the support of the system.

3. It Involves the Support of Slave-Laws and Slave-Policy.

This leads us to say, that it is a position which, whether Mr. Rankin will or not, involves him in the support of slave-laws and slave-policy. Let us try his principle in other cases.

Here is a community, blasted by the curse of intemperance, rapidly driving headlong to perdition. Its laws encourage distilleries and license dram-shops. Premiums are annually offered for the manufacture of the choicest liquors. The entire policy of the government is in favor of drunkenness. A reforming movement is set on foot. The wickedness and dreadful effects of intemperance, of the grog-shop system, and the policy of the government which encourages the evil, are discussed and denounced. Many are converted to the cause of temperance, and they agree as to the duty of using all their moral and political power to renovate the commonwealth. The community is divided into two political parties. One of them perceiving that capital may be raised from the temperance movement, drags it into politics, takes up the cause of drunkenness, and denounces the measures and advocates of reform. The other finds it necessary to show equal zeal. It avows its friendship to the license system—stigmatizes its opponents as disturbers of the common peace—pledges itself to uphold the rights of drunkards. Both parties demand a profession of hostility to temperance, as a condition to office. Now let us ask a few questions. Would it be consistent for temperance men to give their votes to either of such parties? Would it not sound ridiculous for an eloquent advocate of reform, to talk of the propriety of yielding support to that drunkard, who, on the whole "would do most for the country"? Do we not see that the government of such a community would be just as safe, so far as essentials were concerned, in the hands of one set of rum-drinkers and rum-patrons, as another? Could its policy be changed, would dram-shops be abolished, would distilleries be discouraged, so long as temperance men gave notice, that though they should prefer a sober man, yet they would vote for a drunkard or a rum-selling, rum-drinking advocate, if "upon the whole" they "believed he would do most for the country"?

The truth is, considering the relations of the government to the evil, after the question had been taken into politics, to vote for a drunkard, or a man pledged to maintain the whole system of intemperance, would be equivalent to voting for the evil itself and all its appendages.

Another case. (We dwell upon these illustrations, rather than merely glance at them, so that the mind may have a full conception of the absurdity, shall we call it? of the principle we are discussing. And we select cases not the most agreeable to a refined taste, because we are convinced that we shall never deal faithfully with slavery in church or state, until we reduce it to its proper grade—ranking it with the most detestable crimes.)

Let us suppose fornication is encouraged among us by law. Public provision is made for illegitimate. Brothels are licensed all over the country, constituting a source of public revenue. Marriage is discouraged by rigid restrictions. So far have custom and law contributed to strip the crime of its odious aspects, and establish it as a popular thing, that the church has learned to tolerate it. Nay, it provides seats for the fornicator, and finds apologists for this gross offence against human nature, this desecration of God's temple. Moral reform commences its operations. Many hearts are taught to revolt at this popular sin. The great object now is, to reform public sentiment, and repeal the laws which sanction crime, and make God's ordinance of matrimony of none effect. Soon one of the two political parties begins to denounce the movement as mischievous and illegal, a fanatical invasion of the rights of human nature. Great excitement rages. The multitude clamor against it. The rival party finds it necessary to vindicate itself against the charge of—purity. Both parties now risk their hopes of success chiefly on the strength of the evidences they may be able to present, that they harbor no design of reforming society, but are in favor of maintaining the old brothel-system. The candidates of both write letters, the orators of both make speeches, to prove, that they are enemies to moral reform—and entirely in favor of supporting the present system of fornication.

We ask Mr. Rankin,—would you, could you support such men for office? Would you not by so doing render yourself a partaker in their abominations? How could you help it? Would you then plead, that it was best to support that fornicator, that man pledged to maintain a criminal system, who on the whole would, in your opinion, "do most for the country"? How long before brothels would be put down, while you continued voting for men, pledged to build them up? How long before marriage would be made honorable, while you and your moral reform brethren should continue to put men in office, bound to make it dishonorable?

Is slaveholding a less crime than intemperance or fornication? Mr. Rankin does not think so. He believes that it is deeper in the dye of its wickedness, and more ruinous in its consequences, than either. Slaveholding and its appendages are upheld by laws, for many of which we are directly responsible, for the rest, indirectly. The system stands on pillars, whose basis is the whole Union. The policy of our national government, the black laws of the free states, and their constitutional responsibilities, all operate steadily, in support of the evil. The whole subject is now under discussion. Christian civilization has pronounced it the great question of

modern times. A world-movement is in progress against it. Every where the public mind is agitated. In our own country it has been carried into politics. One party finds a transient advantage in denouncing it. Its rival is equally zealous in proscribing it. Each one assumes the badge of the slaveholder. They vie with each other in their concessions to the prejudice and power which uphold slavery; in their assiduous efforts to demonstrate their anti-abolition hostility. Their candidates are slaveholders, or pledged pro-slavery men. What is the duty of an abolitionist in this case? What was the duty of the moral reform, of the temperance advocate, in the cases just supposed? Would Mr. Rankin have voted for the drunkard or fornicator? Will he vote for the slaveholder? If he will, then, in our opinion, he will vote directly for slavery in the District of Columbia, the slave-trade between the states, the extension of the dominion of slavery by the admission of Florida, and the entire pro-slavery policy of government; and indirectly give his sanction to the principle which lies at the basis of slavery, which is, that there is no right but that of brute force. Far be it from us to say, that Mr. Rankin would do such things intentionally; but such would be the real nature of his action. He cannot help it. It is vain for an abolitionist to think of laying this question of abolition aside, (as Mr. Slade fondly hoped he could,) when he votes. Politicians have introduced it into politics, and made hostility to it, a test—a necessary condition to office. By the leaders of both parties this has been done, so that the abolitionist who votes with either party in the presidential contest, cannot help voting in favor of slavery and against his own cause. It is a PLEDGED SLAVERY TICKET, which he supports.

Let us repeat again, that our confidence in the christian character of Mr. Rankin is undiminished. We are now exposing what we believe to be, the real character of the policy he recommends.

4. It Necessarily Involves a Violation of God's Faith.

Abolitionists have always contended, that the southern people in holding slaves, the northern people in countenancing slavery, and the whole nation in upholding slave-laws, have practically given the lie to their own professions. Their creed, put forth on the birth-day of the republic, in the sight of the world, under the solemn sanctions of an oath, when they called God to witness to the rectitude of their intentions, and honesty of their convictions, declares—"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." The adoption of this creed was a sublime religious act. Publishing it to the world, and appealing to God for their sincerity, they necessarily pledged their faith to God and man, that they would always within their empire, faithfully and fully carry out in practice these grand principles. From the date of the Declaration up to this hour, their faith has been broken. They have deceived the world, they have insulted God. Their republic bears the brand of a lie, upon its forehead. Hundreds of thousands of slaves have found refuge in the grave from their oppression, and their blood is crying to God for vengeance on a perjured nation. Nearly three millions of living victims are now writhing in the deadly grasp of their power. An essential requisite in the character of every candidate for a federal office is, that he be either an oppressor himself, or a pledged supporter of oppression—in other words, that he either practically or professionally falsify the vital principles, to the steadfast, and perpetual support of which, the nation is sworn. Only on this condition, will this nation confer office upon him. Now we ask, do not the American people, every time they elect a president (if the United States, under such circumstances, break their faith to God and man,—violate the solemn oath which consecrated them a nation! The people of Ohio, in the eighth article of their constitution, after providing that no religious test shall be required as a qualification for office, declare—"But religion, morality, and knowledge being essentially necessary to the good government and happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged by legislative provision, not inconsistent with the rights of conscience." They thus pledge themselves to each other & to the world, that they will always countenance religion and morality, and encourage the dissemination of knowledge by schools and other means of instruction. Now suppose with a few exceptions, every second year since the formation of their constitution, they had elected as their governor, a man notorious for his ignorance and his opposition to the spread of knowledge, religion and morality—that they had chosen him for this very reason, in opposition to candidates, distinguished for their devotion to universal education, whom they very reason, they had rejected. Would they not be justly chargeable with violating their pledged faith, with falsifying their own declarations? We are aware it may be said, that the cases are not parallel. The Declaration of Independence is not the Constitution of the United States. True, but it is a document more solemn, more sublime, more imperative in its obligations. That document is an agreement, not between the citizens of the United States, as to the details of their government, but an agreement with the world and with the Supreme Ruler of the world, as to the principles by which the American people bound themselves forever to be controlled, whatever form of government they might adopt. Have they ever repealed this Declaration? They could not do it. The principles therein recognized in regard to human rights are immutable, and everlasting in their obligation. Repeat it! Why, does not the whole nation once every year present itself before God, read this Declaration, and renew their oath of allegiance to its principles, "appealing

to the Supreme Ruler of the world for the rectitude of their intentions"? And this it does, while every four years it confers its highest offices on the men, who can give the clearest evidence of their disregard of those principles!—Such perjury is horrible.

We charge upon the position, assumed by Mr. Rankin, that it is identical with the position of the whole American people. An abolitionist, who votes for a candidate, set up because he is a slaveholder, or for one who electioneers for himself on the ground that he is favorable to the pretensions of slaveholders, friendly to slavery, or unfriendly to movements against it, joins with the multitude in falsifying the principles of the Declaration of Independence. This is a hard saying, but where is the flaw in our argument? Point it out, and we will confess we have done injustice to our friend. Let us repeat again, we separate the noble man, from this most base and ruinous position. We may be mistaken. We do not wish to dogmatize. Our venerable friend has grey hairs on his side; nevertheless, with some diffidence, we claim that truth is on our side.

2. Another Unsound Position.

Mr. Rankin says, that he is at least as much bound to prevent the election of Martin Van Buren as of General Harrison. If he stay away from the polls or cast his vote for a third ticket, he does in effect vote for the former.

In the first place, the assumption reflects strongly upon democratic abolitionists. It seems to take for granted that they are either exceedingly few, or else too enslaved by their party to sunder the ties which bind them to it. This is a mistake. We have recently made a good deal of inquiry, and find, that there are far more democrats in our ranks, than we had supposed. In this country, a considerable portion of our number belongs to that party; and it is but just to say, that we have not yet found one, who would vote for Martin Van Buren. On the contrary, very many of the whig abolitionists in Cincinnati have resolved to subordinate their abolition to their party preferences. J. B. Mahan, writing from Sardinia, Brown co., bears similar testimony to the fidelity of democratic abolitionists in that region. It would be well, if our leading men, when discussing this question, would bear these facts in mind. Invidious allusions to a particular party, are mischievous, and detrimental to their own influence. It becomes abolitionists to deal impartially with both parties. A remark of Mr. Mahan seems to explain this difference in the strength of the party-attachments of the two classes of abolitionists. The democrats have no hope of their party; the whigs do expect something from theirs, because they have not yet seen it in power.

But, this assumption of Mr. Rankin is constantly pressed by Harrison abolitionists, as if they thought that, should Martin Van Buren succeed through our refusal to vote, we should be just as guilty of electing him as if we had voted for him. These are neither logic nor candor in such a course. I refuse to go a journey with my friend, and he is robbed in consequence. My refusal is the same in effect, as if I had robbed him,—that is, he is stripped of his property. But, is there no moral difference between the two acts? The act of robbing is wicked in itself, and would necessarily involve me in guilt. The act of refusing to journey with him, might be right or wrong, according to circumstances. There might be good and sufficient reasons for it, in which case, no part of my friend's misfortune could be charged on me. Mr. Rankin, residing in a slave-state, is elected to the legislature. A bill with most objectionable features is introduced for the gradual abolition of slavery. Two large parties in the legislature, nearly balanced, are opposed to each other on the question—one, resolved to perpetuate the other, to abolish slavery. Beside these there is a small party, with Mr. Rankin at its head, differing from both in this,—it holds that slavery ought to be abolished immediately. It is an important moment. With Mr. Rankin and his friends rests the decision of the question. He sees, that if the bill should be passed, so far from the hour of emancipation being hastened, it would be retarded. So much evil in his estimation will result from the operation of the bill should it become a law, that the legislature will finally be induced to repeal it in despair of accomplishing any thing. Under such views Mr. Rankin votes against the bill, which is the same in effect, as if he had joined the slavery party,—that is, the bill is defeated. But, is there no difference between the act of voting on principle, and the act of joining a slavery party against principle?

The abolitionist refuses to vote for the whig party, or in supporting a third ticket, votes against it, and it is defeated. This is the same in effect as if he had voted with the Van Buren party. But, is it the same in fact? Is there no difference in the moral quality of the two acts? We must carefully distinguish our own acts, performed under a sense of duty, from the effects which may follow, in the order of providence, or which may result from the passions of others called into play by them.

Abolitionists have been charged again and again with the blame of all the mobs which have raged against them. Their course has excited the passions of the rabble, and in effect been the same as if they had themselves instigated the mob. Candid men have not been convinced of the guilt of abolitionists by such reasoning: neither will abolitionists think themselves guilty of electing Martin Van Buren, should he by their refusal to vote or their voting a third ticket, succeed in the contest. The question whether they shall vote a third ticket is to be decided by higher considerations, than those which relate to the effect it may have on the success of either party.

3. The Argument from a Comparison of Parties. Mr. Rankin relies much on the argument drawn from a consideration of the strength and depravity of the democratic, and the weakness and comparative virtue of the whig, party. "The two last democratic legislatures in this

state have disgraced us. Democrats have taken away the right of petition in Congress. They have bid abolitionists defiance in the very outset. The Democratic party has been gaining power and overreaching on the rights of the people during the past twelve years. They have abolished the right of petition, and the President has exercised more power than most of the monarchs of Europe. More corruptions seldom existed in any government.—Such a power is dangerous to the nation. It is unsafe to give it the growth of another four years. Continue the democratic party in power after what they have done during two years past, and what will they not be emboldened to do?"

This is a pretty fair specimen of the panicle style in which some abolitionists are apt to speak of the democratic party. Granting the representation to be just, still it furnishes no reason why we should vote for a slavery-ticket, if our argument concerning the moral quality of such voting be sound. But, the representation is not true in point of fact. We are now venturing on delicate ground. Some of our friends are so possessed with the devil of suspicion, that if an anti-slavery editor dare to be impartial and correct exaggeration respecting either party, he is at once set down as a partisan in disguise. We know however our own position, and shall not be driven from our duty, by a fear that others will place us in a false position. Some call us a Van Buren man, some, a whig. Thank God, we are neither. We exercise the right of a freeman in defining our own position, and if others choose to misinterpret it, after all we have said, they will show a lack of good sense as well as candor.

What to Fear from Democrats.

Let us see then what we have to fear from the Democratic party. It has been in power twelve years, but so far from having as Mr. Rankin says grown stronger during that time, it is a notorious fact that for the last six years it has become weaker.

Do you not recollect the majorities by which Gen. Jackson went in? But what was the majority of Van Buren? Why for a long while the race was so even between him and his competitor, that the people could not tell who was ahead. A very strong opposition continually gathering strength from the democratic party itself, and from that large class of persons who in ordinary times are never known as partisans, holds this party in check. As to its encroachments on the liberties of the people, they are no greater than would have been those of any party in power. The majority in a republic is always disposed to the commission of acts which seem tyrannical to the minority, and in many cases, really are so. Its policy towards abolitionists, detestable as it has been, has wrought them no harm. Better a palpable than hidden devil. We should fear more from the insidious advances of the slave power under cover of a party rendered decent by a consciousness of weakness, than from its direct, flat-footed violence exerted through a party confident in its power. The gross, absurd, outrageously proscriptive policy of the democrats has served to show the country, to some extent, the unscrupulous, self-aggrandizing ambition of the slave power, and how deeply the virus of slavery has affected the vitals of the nation; and, in its attacks on the right of petition, it has awakened the fears of the American people, and enlisted the sympathy of many, otherwise indifferent, in behalf of the anti-slavery cause. So far from having put down free discussion on the slavery question, it has rather forced it, as a measure of defence on the part of those who would have been silent had it been less vindictive and violent.—Last congress it gave rise to a most protracted discussion on the subject, a discussion that could hardly have taken place under the system of quiet management recommended by Henry Clay. Much reflection has led us to the conclusion, that there is nothing in the present power of the party to excite the alarm of abolitionists. Its capabilities for mischief are diminished.—Its impotence on this question during the last congress was more and more manifest.—

Let it not be forgotten that the atrocious resolution abrogating the right of petition was prepared by a leading whig from a slave state, and supported by all the slave-holding whig members, except four; and that the democratic delegation from the free states, amenable as it has habitually been to the slave-interest, split upon the question, only 27 supporting and 39 opposing the resolution. The same symptoms of division were discovered in the last legislature of this state. A bundle of anti-abolition resolutions introduced by Mr. Flood, and backed by all his influence, failed by a tie vote, and a change of the vote of the mover himself from the affirmative to the negative. Another batch brought forward by Mr. Fisher, met with no better treatment: the party became ashamed of them, and they were recommitted never to appear again. While the abolitionists therefore have nothing to hope from the democratic party, unless indeed a more striking revelation of the all-grasping ambition of the slave power, they certainly have not enough cause for apprehension to induce them to sever from their anti-slavery principles. "Well, but you forget the army bill of Mr. Poinsett." No, we do not. If this be not a slaveholding measure, it will never succeed in its present form, so antagonist is it to the genius and interests and common sense of the American people. If it be a slaveholding project, it will succeed just as easily under a whig as democratic administration—for, as we have proven again and again, the whig party has committed itself to the keeping of the slave power. This power, however, formidable as it is, is not invincible. It has been met in the case of the Texan project, and baffled, notwithstanding it was aided by the administration. And, let but this scheme of Mr. Poinsett be demonstrated to be a plan for securing slavery, by providing a

standing army against slave-insurrections, and it will again be met and baffled, no matter by what administration it may be seconded. There is a point beyond which even the slavery-ridden North will not go in docile servility.

The Argument from the Comparative Weakness and More Favorable Composition of the Whig Party.

As to the comparative weakness and more favorable composition of the whig party, Mr. Rankin contents himself with a brief statement of his opinion. Let us also show our opinions. This party is composed of three classes of persons. First, the office seekers, demagogues and statesmen; who constitute the activity of the organization, and dictate its policy. Secondly, a majority of the mercantile and commercial classes—the capitalists—the large manufacturers and farmers—those in fact who represent the material interests of the community. These compose the substance, the permanent element of the party, and prescribe its principles. Thirdly, a class of independent, conservative men, some attached from sympathy in opinion, some clinging to the party, because a minority seeking power is apt to be more conciliatory, and less openly corrupt than a majority in power.—This class had some influence before the whigs were nationally organized. While they constituted a kind of congregational party, in different states they could pursue different policies. In the northern states they could safely venture to conciliate temperance men and abolitionists, and the chief exception to this rule so far as abolitionists were concerned, was seen in the states bordering on the slave-states. Hence, the somewhat favorable action of the whig party in Massachusetts and New York, and its indifferent policy in Ohio and the other western states. In the western legislatures, with here and there an exception, it has been uniformly and openly hostile to us. The Black Law was carried by the votes not only of democrats, but whigs. If its most ardent opposers were furnished by the whigs, so were its most eloquent and efficient defenders. In the various anti-abolition resolves that have been passed, the whigs have borne their part extremely well.—The truth is, Ohio adjoins a slave-state, and the party has been studious not to give the democrats a handle against it. In the other states mentioned, the action of the party has taken on rather a favorable complexion, because, in regard to the whole Union, being a minority, it sought adherents, & because it was not yet nationally organized & placed under the surveillance of the South. The gag-resolves of Congress were protested against, partly because the sentiment of the party was not yet fettered by the slave power, and partly, because these resolves were a part of the scheme of democratic tactics. In the west, however, we again notice a difference. The whig party in the west showed no symptom of indignation at the denial of the right of petition by the last Congress. Scarcely a whig press raised a note of protest. The Republican in this city, the Harrison organ, spoke with much complacency of the act, and great contempt of Mr. Slade's speech. As Mr. Purdy of the Free Press insists strongly on the fact, that the whig party has been strenuous in maintaining the right of petition, we hope he will take in good part our attempt to throw some light upon the causes of it. There is one thing he always neglects, when discoursing so eloquently on this peculiarity of his party; and that is, to tell his readers, that his famous advocates of the right of petition in Congress, do it with great fear and trembling, and are endless in their accompanying disclaimers of hatred to slavery or friendship to abolition. One of the chief reasons urged by them is, that the course they recommend would in fact secure the object of the slaveholder, by stilling the anti-slavery agitation at the north. Scarcely any in Congress have had the magnanimity to come out openly, and, without but or if, plant their foot on the sole ground of right, and declare a trespass on the right of petition; treason against the constitution and against human nature. We confess our souls have been filled with loathing, when reading of the tame opposition of a majority of whig members in Congress to the encroachments of slave-holders, as, with hat in hand, bowing in all humility, they besought the tyrants not to invade the right of petition, at the same time however assuring them most earnestly that no offence was meant against slavery. We do not thank such persons for their interference. We want men in Congress, not slaves—men who feel that they have souls, and will not permit them, any more than they will suffer the rights of their constituents, to be shackled. And, what great matter is it, to be represented by men, who while they vote against abridgements of the right of petition, are eager to show their allegiance to the slaveholder by opposing every movement in favor of the rights of the slave? These dough-faces speak the truth when they say, that slave holders are only helping the abolitionists by their violence. We know it. It is a good thing, that if the free should do nothing for the slave, they should be compelled to suffer with him.—It is better, while all redress is denied to this poor victim, that the right of petition and of discussion should be trampled upon. It will serve to identify our rights, and our interests with his. We have less hope of a confirmed colonizationist, than a slaveholder. The former does more damage to the anti-slavery cause than the latter. And we confess we would rather have as our opponent in Congress a downright slavery man, than one of your half-and-half, milk-and-water gradualists. The consciences of these men you can scarcely ever reach, and they have just that kind of respectability and moderation, which serves to give countenance to the wrong side, and make the "worse appear the better reason." But the former, if invulnerable themselves to conviction, by their violence and unsophisticated absurdities, show off to great effect the wickedness of their position, reveal in

its naked deformity the evil they advocate, and thus convince others.

We come now to the time, when the whig party was formally organized as a national party—when a common nomination broke up northern sectionalism, and imposed the necessity of a common policy. Be it remembered, that the organization extended North and South; that a perfect union of men of like political sentiments in both was necessary to insure success; that the South for the last twenty years has ruled in all parties; that slaveholders into whatever association they come bring slavery with them, and make it the supreme consideration. Bear in mind all this, and you will be prepared to understand, what that common policy was. Call to mind too the composition of the whig party, and you will see at once in the character and affinities of two of its classes the reasons why they should not feel very sensitive as to the adoption of a pro-slavery policy. At first fearful of throwing off those who had been conciliated by favorable tokens, the whole party moved cautiously. While slavery was not condemned, neither was abolition denounced. In a little while, however, driven to disclose its true character by the repeated charges of its opponents, in danger of losing the South, encouraged by certain indications in Virginia, presuming that abolitionists on the whole were pretty generally committed, and commanded by the Slave-Power,—the demagogues, office-seekers, and statesmen, come out openly and broadly against abolition, act on the assumption that anti-abolition is a requisite to office, and endeavor to supersede the democracy on its own ground—that of slavery. We refer now to the conduct of General Harrison, of Daniel Webster and the whig senators at Alexandria, of Ogden Hoffman at Fredricksburg, to the policy of the whig press in the free states, and to the unrebuked, open-mouthed anti-abolition policy of the whole party in the South, &c. &c. These developments have excited no displeasure, that we can see, in the second class, the principal element of the party; nor has the conduct of the third class been such as became freemen, or was calculated to impose restraint on their leaders.

The question now to be decided is, can abolitionists reasonably expect more in behalf of their cause from the whig party, in the event of its success, than from the democratic? We answer no, and found our opinion on the following reasons.

1. The two great classes which go to make up the whig party have never, as such, shown any friendship for the rights of the slave.—Their affinities even now are generally with the slaveholder.

2. The favorable indications which some gather from the past action of the party, are of a date anterior to its national organization, while as yet it was an uncertain minority, before it was banded together in the support of a nomination, controlled by the South, and before it was placed under the surveillance of the Slave Power; and of course can constitute no ground for judging what will be the action of the party when all the circumstances are changed.

3. Since then, it has equalled the rival party in open defection of principle on the slavery-question, and in gross concessions and pledges of fealty to the slaveholder, thus authorizing us to infer, that the same power which impels to the adoption of this policy now, being permanent in its character, will produce the same result after the election.

4. The third class of the party has refrained from rebuking this policy, and has exerted no influence in restraining it. Therefore, we can expect nothing from its influence hereafter; for, the same reasons which now keep it silent, viz., the alleged greater depravity of the democratic party, and the importance of certain questions regarding the currency and public money, will continue to operate.

5. The party would be stronger immediately after than before its triumph; for multitudes always crowd to worship the rising sun. Therefore we can hope nothing from its weakness.

6. The same important political questions, which now furnish a pretext for postponing the claims of the anti-slavery cause, and an apology for the servile conduct of the whig leaders, cannot, as every man of sense knows, be settled for the next three or four years. Consequently during that time, they will furnish the same pretext, the same apology, for like postponement and conduct.

If such be the event, and we certainly have all the reasons that common sense can demand for predicting that it will be, what policy would Mr. Rankin and Mr. Blanchard and their friends then adopt? They would begin to think it high time to change the administration. They would talk of its awful corruptions—its growing power—its encroachments on the rights of the people—of the necessity of keeping the sea of power in motion—of the opposition-party being on the whole more favorable—for of course, as a minority it would be pursuing for the time a very civil and moderate course—and any way owing to its weakness, it could be more easily dislodged. So to work they would go, advising all good abolitionists to support the candidates of the minority, notwithstanding the overwhelming evidence that might be furnished in the sequel of its pro-slavery bondage.—Thus forever would they keep the nation writhing within the folds of the slave-power; and really think they were doing the country service, by changing one tool of slavery for another—by keeping up a rotation of candidates, always dictated to them by the slaveholder.—Our brethren must excuse us. For such low management, (we can find no better name for this policy,) we have no taste. Compare it with the course of action now advocated by so many abolitionists. We plant our foot on the ground, that no matter which of the present parties may be in power, the slaveholder will dictate

the measures of government—slavery will be the controlling element of its policy. Our principle then is, a principle by which we are willing to stand or fall, that we ought not to vote for any candidate for office, who is not openly hostile to the evil, and in favor of carrying out faithfully the principles of the Declaration of Independence. We care not what party may win or lose, in consequence of this determination, for no real good can be gained to the country till the government be rescued from the grasp of the slaveholder; and never will this be done, till the people of the North resolve not to vote for a slaveholder, or a man who will support or defend his practice; and this will never be, till abolitionists set the noble example. Here is fair and open ground. On it we stand above the low strife of parties. It brings us into exalted association with the fathers of our republic. It elevates our principles above danger, and saves our character as anti-slavery men.

Few indeed we may now be; but, if there be half the principle and sagacity in this nation which is claimed for it, we must increase, and our opponents decrease.

One or two general remarks, and we shall conclude. It seems to us providential, that the pro-slavery corruption of the whig party should have become manifest in time. For a period it was so cautious in movement, that abolitionists were near being deceived, and were strongly tempted to become careless of their principles; but the cloven foot was shown in season to prove to them the presence of a demon, and admonish them to beware of an unclean party. And now in the name of common sense, we ask, what more reasons than they have, could they have, why they should not vote for either party?

There is a tide in the affairs of men which taken at the flood doth lead to fortune. So said, old Shakespeare; and the wise man says, there is a time for every thing. To have attempted immediately after the last election, to enlist abolitionists against a slavery-ticket would have been labor wasted. And why? Because no ticket was before them—no important election was pending—no special acts of hostility to free principles were arousing indignation against both parties—no reason existed for discussion or decision.—Politicians themselves never think of organizing till the time for action draws nigh. It has been recommended to wait until after the coming contest and then organize! Where would be your forces? What your reasons? What would remain to be done?—And where would be those feelings of patriotic indignation and grief which now glow in the breasts of abolitionists? "Strike while the iron is hot."

This is good advice. We are all now warm. Recent developments have produced great excitement. A genuine anti-slavery enthusiasm prevails in our ranks. And are we to let all this evaporate in idle talk and boastful promises of what we will do at some future period? Postpone action at this time, and the generous enthusiasm which now inflames and exalts your hearts, will gradually die out. Now, now is the time to act. The nearer the time, for a decision, the easier to decide. The more intense the feeling, the more energetic will be the action.

Never let us forget, that the slaveholder has undervalued our sincerity. Once convince him that there is a band of freemen in the free states resolved to sacrifice all party attachments rather than vote for a slaveholder—resolved at the hazard of annihilating every existing political party, to place the government in the hands of anti-slavery men, and from that moment he would read the doom of the curse that he cherishes.

POLITICIANS AND ABOLITION.

The whig press does not relish the independent action of Abolitionists. The Ohio Atlas, published at Elyria, edited by a clergyman, who calls himself an Abolitionist, but who has steadfastly shown a greater love for his party than the slave, has the following choice paragraph:—"Political Abolition. Third Party Organization. Political Party Tactics of their Press. It is due to ourselves and our readers, to say that the next number of the Philanthropist which we received after expressing our dissent to the positions of B. F. respecting the ground taken by the Editor of that paper, overthrew all our good opinion of the good sense of the Editor. In short, he has plunged head and ears into the political campaign, and is electing General Harrison with a zeal perhaps even surpassing that of our friend Leavitt of the Emancipator, and in the abuse, as we must, at present call it, and misrepresentations (doubtless unintentional) of certain prominent Whigs, he is laying himself fairly along side of Mr. Garrison of the Liberator. We say it not in anger, but in grief, that the Anti-Slavery press generally at this moment, is exhibiting the legitimate fruits of the recently promulgated doctrines of certain men who would be leaders among them—running headlong the career of detraction, personal abuse, &c., characteristic of the low party tactics of a degraded Locooco press. The Philanthropist, for example, has been occupying itself in the contemptible employment of manufacturing articles for the use of the Ohio Statesman! And it is done with a garbling dishonesty which required no addition even to suit that paper and its allies."

This editor with great gusto quotes the letter of Mr. Rankin, in support of his views of abolition-duty. It is but just to ourselves to say, that the gentleman has told a simple untruth, when he says that we are occupied in manufacturing articles for the Ohio Statesman. We were prepared for his abuse, and think nothing of it, but he must take back this saying of his, or justly incur the odium of a falsifier.

The next paragraph we shall quote is from the Xenia Free Press, another Harrison Abolition paper.

"Medical.—If Doctor Bailey deals out medicine as profusely for the physical infirmities of his patients as for the political errors of his friends, he must make short work of them. Kill or cure must be his motto. For six weeks past he has lavished his political panacea upon us without stint. Week after week, it came in heavy doses. The Philanthropist of the 4th inst. brings us the last dose. It consists of some half dozen pills, some of them composed of extracts from old letters of Gen. Harrison, written between 1821 and 1838. They are of the same character with those that have already appeared in the Free Press. Doctor, do please change the medicine. I can take any more of that."

Friend Purdy's abolition does not improve much by its connection with Harrisonism. The Free Press also sustains itself by the letters of

our friends Rankin and Blanchard. These same letters we find quoted as containing excellent sentiments by several papers in the state, which from year's end to year's end, scarcely have a word in behalf of the slave.

The Urbana Citizen says—

"The Ohio Statesman, the official organ of the Locooco press like the Free Press, the leading Abolition paper in the State, are becoming very rabid in their opposition to Gen. Harrison, since the commencement of dog-days. Have the Locoocos and the ultra Abolitionists of Ohio formed a coalition for the purpose of defeating Old Tip in this State!—We ask for information—what's all?"

And is that all? No. You intended to convey a false impression by that question, neighbor, or we are greatly mistaken. As for the Statesman we have no dealings with it—never have exchanged with it—never see it. Are you really so ignorant as to suspect such a coalition? O, shame!

The following is from the Hamilton Intelligencer, edited by an anti-slavery man.

"We would advise the Cincinnati Philanthropist for the sake of consistency, to put under its editorial head, something like this: 'For President of the U. S. Martin Van Buren—Sub-Treasurer—Low Prices—A Standing Army in time of Peace—Blood Hounds in the service—Black laws—and Gag laws.' Such would be the end of its operations, and it certainly would be but proper to mention it."

This is all humbuggery, friend.

The Democratic papers are no less friendly. The Monroe (Mich.) Times, says—

"If the abolitionists are really honest in the course they are pursuing, they certainly deserve credit at least for consistency, and so far we have not a word to say. If they cannot consistently with their professions support either of the nominated candidates, they ought by all means to select some one that is worthy of their suffrages. It is however our purpose now to enquire how far the abolitionists are acting in good faith in supporting a third candidate, and whether their whole movement is not in fact another of those cowardly tricks resorted to by the federal party, in order to deceive the people; whether it is not a game to pacify the southern 'whigs,' and make them believe that Gen. Harrison is in favor of the slaveholding interest."

And then he goes into an argument to show that this is the real scheme, concluding as follows.

"We may have underrated the sincerity of the abolitionists in the course they are pursuing—if so, we beg their pardon; but we shall look for stronger demonstrations of their sincerity before we can be brought to the belief that they are honest in their movements. Their votes in November will be the strongest test."

The Louisville Advertiser also compliments the sincerity of Abolitionists.

"The Abolitionists had been made to believe that they would find a faithful and efficient ally in the available, and it would seem they cannot brook disappointment with composure. In New York, Ohio and Michigan, movements have lately been made by Abolitionists in favor of separate organization. They denounce Mr. Van Buren, but say an open enemy is preferable to a hollow-hearted friend."

"We know not, however, what to make of the demonstrations to which we allude. We cannot do less than suspect they are designed to deceive the people of the South—and that the Conventions proposed in New York, Ohio and Michigan will assemble, discuss the claims of the candidates, and break up without coming to any practical conclusion. They may threaten to abandon Harrison, but will scarcely resolve, in good faith, to do so."

It should really rejoice independent Abolitionists to be thus spoken of by heated partisans. To be praised by a hackneyed party-press would make me suspect my own sincerity. However, we may remark, that should the policy of Harrison Abolitionists prevail, slaveholders will be confirmed in their belief of the insincerity of the whole body, and democrats may urge with some show of reason, that Abolition is only a device of the whigs for the overthrow of democracy.

We may as well in this connection copy a remark made concerning Mr. Blanchard by the editor of the Pennsylvania Freeman.

"In conclusion, we will say—since brother Blanchard's letter assigning his reasons for intending to vote for Harrison, we have the occasion of our remarks—that it gives us sincere pleasure to find, as we do by a late Philanthropist, that our esteemed brother has somewhat changed his views since the recent disclosures."

"We are authorized to say," says the Philanthropist, "that in view of the late developments, and of the imminent danger to which abolition integrity is subjected by strong party feeling, Mr. B. would not feel warranted in penning such a letter now."

"Nor, we hope, in pursuing the course it advocates, for surely he could not feel warranted in doing, what he would not feel warranted in defending."

AMALGAMATION.

We charged upon Mr. Purdy of the Free Press, some time since, an intention to merge Abolitionism in Whigism. He repels the charge, saying—"His fears are groundless, as far as we are concerned, and we have not observed that disposition to merge Abolitionism in whigism which he sees."

We believe Friend Purdy is totally deceived. In the same number of his paper, commenting on a paragraph of ours relating to the Hamilton Convention, which concludes as follows—"Let us remember, how much now depends on our fidelity to abolition principle," he says:

"And let all whose minds have not been so exclusively occupied with the wrongs of the slave as to lose sight of their own rights, the Anti-Slavery press generally, let them remember that of the two great parties into which the nation is divided, the one in power is aiming at the concentration of all power in the hands of the Executive, and the subversion of the Constitutional rights of the free, while the other maintains these rights and endeavors to preserve the checks and balances of the Constitution. Let them reflect that by uniting with the latter they can preserve their own rights, while, by separate action they will lose them, without gaining any thing for the slave. In short, let them remember the fable of the dog that lost his piece of meat by grasping at his shadow."

If this is not a palpable recommendation to Abolitionists, to amalgamate with the whig party, and identify the interests of their holy cause with its interests, then we can see nothing. But this is not the worst. Does not the editor of the Free Press blush, to put his (whig) grievances in comparison with the wrongs of the slave? He will permit us to say, that we regard all this talk about the subversion of the rights of the free by the Executive, as mere stuff. We cannot remember the time, when in the estimation of one of the parties, the Executive of this nation has not been despotic, and imminent danger has not threatened the liberties of the people.

It is an established practice with parties, to charge each other with the worst designs. Still, notwithstanding the terrible despotism, which during every four years since Washington's term, has brooded over this afflicted nation, we cannot see but, that the people are yet free, and likely to remain so, so far as the mere action of the democratic or whig party is concerned. But, without figure of speech, there is

a despotism in our country, which continually threatens our liberties—we mean, the slave interest. There is no poetry in saying, that this power has already struck down many of the most precious rights of the American citizen. It is a fact, that it has abrogated the right of petition. It is a fact, that it has annihilated freedom of debate in Congress. It is a fact, that it has destroyed freedom of speech and the press in the South. It is a fact, that it has taken away the right of locomotion from that class of American citizens who believe that slavery ought to be immediately abolished. It is a fact, that it deprives men of the right of holding the highest offices of the federal government, because of their anti-slavery principles. It is a fact, that it has so far encroached on the rights of the two great political parties at the North, as to make them slaves to its will. It is a fact, that it ordains in many cases the sale of slaves of men and women who are regarded as citizens in many of the free states. It is a fact, that it has destroyed the right of private correspondence by establishing a villanous censorship over the post-office. It is a fact, that it has attempted to move northern legislatures to put down freedom of opinion by law. It is a fact, that it has excited mobs, pulled down presses, burnt houses, and taken life, in the free states. It is a fact, that it has taken away from us the enjoyment of a pure gospel and an unadulterated, unutilized literature. It is a fact, that it has emasculated the statesmen and leading political men of the North. It is a fact, that in direct opposition to the intentions of the founders of this republic, it has extended its dominion vastly beyond its prescribed bounds, and in defiance of the spirit and principles of the federal constitution, exalted itself into the ruling element in our government. And it is a fact, that it is committing ceaseless robbery on nearly three millions of Americans, stripping them of all rights, cutting them off from all hope in this world, and as far as it can, of all hope in the next. This is not mere declamation; it is glaring reality. And yet, Mr. Purdy can really place our grievances under an administration which he thinks very wicked, in comparison with these tremendous encroachments on the liberties—on the most precious rights of the nation. When Abolitionists can thus deceive themselves as to the comparative intensity and danger of the evils which beset the country, it is time to be alarmed. The truth is, unless we can prevail on the people of the North to think less of their party and their party-grievances, and more of the wrongs of the slave, and the dangerous power of slavery, we may as well give over all effort. It is folly to hope for the redemption of the slave from the action of men, who can see as much danger in the policy of the whig or democrat on the questions of currency, and the public treasure, as in the steady advances of slaveholding domination. We confess, that however much we may respect the general character of such men, their influence, in our estimation, serves only to impair the efficiency of the abolition organization.

We hope independent abolitionists will note the hint in Mr. Purdy's article. What is it, in fact, but a recommendation to Harrison Abolitionists to turn out in numbers sufficient at the convention to do—what? To prevent the convention from denouncing the servility of the whig candidate, and taking a stand equally independent of the two parties. We hope they will be there, and discuss the matter fairly, for many of them we are sure will be convinced. We are not questioning their right, by any means. Only, we would take occasion from such a call, to urge upon all abolitionists who prize the independence of their cause, to be at their post.

STATE ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

The undersigned, at a meeting of Cincinnati Abolitionists, Thursday evening, July 9th, were appointed a Committee to call a Convention of the lower counties of Ohio, and to make all necessary arrangements for the meeting. Having subsequently been solicited from different parts of the state, to extend the call so as to embrace the state, they concluded that, by so doing, they would meet the wishes of a majority of Ohio abolitionists, carry out the spirit of the resolutions which constituted them a committee, and pursue a course demanded by the exigencies of the cause.

They therefore invite all persons who hold the principles embodied in the second article of the Constitution of the Ohio anti-slavery society, to assemble in State-Convention, at Hamilton, Butler county, Tuesday, the first day of September, 1840, to consult on the political duties of anti-slavery men in regard to American slavery.

Measures have been taken to obtain a large attendance of delegates from all parts of the state, to secure a number of able and eloquent speakers, and to make the meeting interesting and efficient.

G. BAILEY,
A. HOPKINS,
C. DONALDSON,
JAS. C. LUDLOW.

CALL FOR A CONVENTION AT HAMILTON.

We request attention to the advertisement of the Committee, appointed to call a Convention at Hamilton.

The strong desires of numerous friends in different parts of the state, determined them after their appointment, to call it as a state-convention of abolitionists.

Two weeks from to-day, the Convention will assemble. Speakers, eloquent and able have been secured. We again say, let every part of the state be represented. Eastern abolitionists are regarding this movement with deep interest. Failure now would be discouraging to the friends every where, and operate most disastrously on our cause. We hope every abolitionist will

think of this, and resolve to sacrifice a great deal rather than be absent.

From Cincinnati we must send at least fifty delegates.

Abolitionists in this city, favorable to the object of the Convention, and resolved to attend, are requested to call immediately at the office on Main street, and leave their names, and places of residence; as conveyances, it is likely, will be provided for a majority of them, free of charge.

We do hope this will be strictly attended to. Let no one think himself so unimportant that he may be dispensed with. Good men and true, we want at our convention, and none but such—but by all means, let us have as many of these as possible.

INDIANA CONVENTION.

The Rev. T. E. Thomas purposes to attend the anniversary of the Green county anti-slavery society—and also, the Indiana Convention, at Newport, August 24th. Mr. Thomas is just the man needed at such meetings—firm, upright, prompt, and eloquent. We hope our Indiana friends will turn out en masse, and show a strong front.

Our friend Bosworth will accept our thanks for his very kind and candid letter.—Still, while we admire the spirit which pervades this letter; we are constrained to differ with him as regards the sound policy for abolitionists. Our reasons have been and will be stated from time to time in the paper.

WORLD-CONVENTION.

We continue the republication of its proceedings, abridging the report, in many parts.—Next week we shall try to conclude it.

OUR PAPER.

Of this week is made up of heavy matter. We were anxious to exhibit our chief objections to the course of Mr. Rankin and those concurring with him, at one view. There is so little time that we must be allowed to crowd our thoughts upon the reader. Subscribers will hardly require an apology, for dealing just now so largely with the political aspects of our cause. They see the necessity of it, we trust. We certainly are under obligations to them for their forbearance, as we are aware that we are crossing the track of many of them. Next week, we shall again publish a great many excellent communications, in favor of independent abolition—also as many as we have received against it. And after that we shall try and make room for the crowd of communications on other bearings of our cause, which have been accumulating for a long time. We wish our paper was larger that we might quote from some of our eastern contemporaries, whose papers are enriched every week by the most valuable articles.

In the long editorial we give to day, we trust there will be found matter, not uninteresting when considered under other than political aspects.

CASH SYSTEM.

More than half of the three months' grace we allowed our subscribers has already elapsed.—Our receipts for the last four weeks have been meagre indeed. Only about six weeks intervene between this and the first of October, at which time as our subscribers know those who shall not have paid in advance will be cut off. We thought we would just give a hint to delinquents, for we have been compelled to use very black-looking paper for a few weeks past.

ONWARD! THE WATCHWORD.

The abolitionists in Portage co., have just issued the following call, signed by 87 names.

To the Friends of Human Rights in Portage co. God hath said "that righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people;" "that rulers should be just, ruling in the fear of God."

Believing this, and believing that the Almighty is provoked, and we, as a people, made a reproach in the eyes of a civilized world, by the manner in which our Representatives in the councils of our National and State legislatures have legislated for a portion of our citizens [for we claim that all the inhabitants of a community, born such, held together by, and acknowledging the principles "that all men are created equally free and independent" are such], by depriving them of all participation in the benefits of the common school system of education, the privilege of making oath in Courts of justice, of jury trial, when liberty is at stake, and even of liberty itself, when no guilt is attached except that they wear a skin a shade darker [perhaps] than those who thus legislate.—Feeling that all who exercise the elective franchise are responsible to God and humanity for those outrages, unless all is done that can be to prevent their recurrence and continuance.

We, the undersigned, earnestly invite such as believe that God hath made of one blood all nations of men, and that we are brethren—and are desirous of having equal laws for all—who will not, who do not put the subject of the currency in competition with the rights of their fellow men, to meet us at the Court house in Ravens, on Tuesday the 15th day of September, at ten o'clock, A. M. to take into consideration the propriety of putting in nomination such men to represent us, as, if elected, will strenuously bear the burden of the existing laws which make distinction among our inhabitants on account of color.

In the fifteenth congressional district a spirited call has also been published, in which the anti-slavery question is recognized as the paramount one, and evidences are presented of the pro-slavery corruption of both parties. It is signed by 73 names, and concludes as follows:

"The question to be decided is, whether we can sanction such sentiments and such policy, by voting for those who avow and uphold them? Can we vote for men who oppose our principles? We have settled this point for ourselves. We cannot do it. Nor do we see how you can do it, without most fatally compromising your political and moral consistency. We cannot believe you will be true to us. We know you will not."

We, therefore, most earnestly invite the voting abolitionists of this 15th congressional district, who are in favor of decided political action against slavery, to meet with us in CONVENTION, at AKRON, SEPTEMBER 10, on Tuesday the 10th of August, at 10 o'clock, A. M. for the purpose of considering the exigencies of the anti-slavery cause; for nominating a candidate for Congress, and devising such measures in reference to county tickets as may be judged proper.

DR. BAILEY.—We often hear from anti-slavery lecturers that it is inconsistent for abolitionists to use the products of slave labor. Now I really wish to be consistent on this subject, as well as every other, and if any of the readers of your paper will tell me how to avoid the evil complained of, I will gladly do it. Do any of

the abolitionists in Cincinnati keep free labor stores? Is there any place in, or about the city where molasses, sugar, coffee, and cotton goods may be obtained, that are not in whole or in part, the products of the unpaid toil of the slave? [We are sorry to say none.—Ed. Phil.]

INFORMATION REQUESTED.
For the Philanthropist.

Highland co. O. August 1st 1840.

MR. EDITOR.—Please suffer me through the Philanthropist, to make the following inquiry.

Whether there is an old school regular Baptist minister in Ohio, who is a firm and public abolitionist; if so, what is his name, and where he lives? For such a man I would very much like to hear from.

A Friend to the slave.

Friend Buffum sends us quite a long column of typographical errors. In justice to our printer we must say, that the hand writing was so minute, and in many places illegible, we wonder he did not make a score more of blunders. As it is, eight of those marked as such, are exactly according to copy. We would just remind correspondents, that a merciful man should be merciful even to the printer.—Ed. Phil.

Greenborough, 8 mo. 11, 1840.

DR. BAILEY:—Dear Friend—I exceedingly regret to find a large number of typographical errors in the "address to Friends," published in the Philanthropist of the 25th ult. Please to publish in the Philanthropist of next week the following catalogue of errors and much oblige thy friend.

ARNOLD BUFUM.

3d paragraph, 5th line, for "friends received" read "friends secured, &c." 8th line, for "en-slaved Americans," read "enslaved Africans."—Last line but one, for "unprofitable steward" read "unprofitable servant."

4th paragraph, 19 and 20th lines, omit the words "in our country." Last line but one, for "universally" read "generally."

6th paragraph, 13th line, for "arising in almost" &c., read "existing in almost, &c." Last line but one, for "all efforts" read "active efforts, &c."

7th paragraph, first line, omit "then." Last but one, for "the oppressed" &c., read "the suffering, &c."

8th paragraph, 18th line, omit "thus." 9th "first line, for "as this should be" read, could be thus, &c."

13th paragraph, 10th line, the quotation points should begin at "the needy."

18th paragraph, at the commencement omit "Again."

19th, para. 6th line, for "the gloomy" read "the most gloomy." Last line for "Regular Meeting 1831" read "Yearly meeting 1837."

20th para. first line, for "that could thus" read "that could then, &c." 6th line read an opportunity to plead the cause, &c."

29th para. 4th line from the end, for "spoleless Paul" read "Apostle Paul."

30th para. 2d line, for "stripes" read "strifes." 32d "last line omit "any."

33d "last line, for "benefits" read "benefit, &c."

40th "3d line, read had a member of the society of Friends, for its first Presiding officer."

41st para. 6th line, for "may strangle" read "might strangle."

42d para. 1st and 2d lines, omit "one by themselves an abolition society, and that it is not proper for them," and read "The notion that Friends ought not to unite with people of other denominations."

NOTE.—Since the publication of the review in the Philanthropist, I learn, that the absurdities of the document are explained by the fact, that a much loved member of the meeting for sufferings, some time since, submitted to that meeting a well written article, commending the anti-slavery cause, and condemning colonizationism in the strongest terms; the colonizationists opposed its adoption, and it was laid by; but now in the absence of that friend, on a religious visit, a colonizationist undertook the task of abridging, and amending the article, so that it is no wonder, that it came forth, "half Jew and half Ashdod." Still the idea is held out, that this strange thing, is from the pen of that dear good friend, who did write all that is good in it, but who never connected, and connected such a mass of absurdities and contradictions.

A. B.

OUR CARD.

MR. ENRON.—I desire to make a short publication in the Philanthropist, by the manner in which our Representatives in the councils of our National and State legislatures have legislated for a portion of our citizens [for we claim that all the inhabitants of a community, born such, held together by, and acknowledging the principles "that all men are created equally free and independent" are such], by depriving them of all participation in the benefits of the common school system of education, the privilege of making oath in Courts of justice, of jury trial, when liberty is at stake, and even of liberty itself, when no guilt is attached except that they wear a skin a shade darker [perhaps] than those who thus legislate.—Feeling that all who exercise the elective franchise are responsible to God and humanity for those outrages, unless all is done that can be to prevent their recurrence and continuance.

We, the undersigned, earnestly invite such as believe that God hath made of one blood all nations of men, and that we are brethren—and are desirous of having equal laws for all—who will not, who do not put the subject of the currency in competition with the rights of their fellow men, to meet us at the Court house in Ravens, on Tuesday the 15th day of September, at ten o'clock, A. M. to take into consideration the propriety of putting in nomination such men to represent us, as, if elected, will strenuously bear the burden of the existing laws which make distinction among our inhabitants on account of color.

In the fifteenth congressional district a spirited call has also been published, in which the anti-slavery question is recognized as the paramount one, and evidences are presented of the pro-slavery corruption of both parties. It is signed by 73 names, and concludes as follows:

"The question to be decided is, whether we can sanction such sentiments and such policy, by voting for those who avow and uphold them? Can we vote for men who oppose our principles? We have settled this point for ourselves. We cannot do it. Nor do we see how you can do it, without most fatally compromising your political and moral consistency. We cannot believe you will be true to us. We know you will not."

We, therefore, most earnestly invite the voting abolitionists of this 15th congressional district, who are in favor of decided political action against slavery, to meet with us in CONVENTION, at AKRON, SEPTEMBER 10, on Tuesday the 10th of August, at 10 o'clock, A. M. for the purpose of considering the exigencies of the anti-slavery cause; for nominating a candidate for Congress, and devising such measures in reference to county tickets as may be judged proper.

DR. BAILEY.—We often hear from anti-slavery lecturers that it is inconsistent for abolitionists to use the products of slave labor. Now I really wish to be consistent on this subject, as well as every other, and if any of the readers of your paper will tell me how to avoid the evil complained of, I will gladly do it. Do any of

the abolitionists in Cincinnati keep free labor stores? Is there any place in, or about the city where molasses, sugar, coffee, and cotton goods may be obtained, that are not in whole or in part, the products of the unpaid toil of the slave? [We are sorry to say none.—Ed. Phil.]

INFORMATION REQUESTED.
For the Philanthropist.

Highland co. O. August 1st 1840.

